

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MANJINDER SINGH BEESLA,

Plaintiff,

v.

PORT OF SEATTLE POLICE,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C21-1155 MJP

DISMISSAL ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's proposed amended complaint. (Dkt. No. 8.) The Court again declines to issue summons under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and DISMISSES the amended complaint without prejudice.

Plaintiff commenced this proceeding by motion to proceed in forma pauperis. (Dkt. No. 1.) The Court granted the motion, (Dkt. No. 4), but declined to issue summons and dismissed the complaint because Plaintiff failed to state a cause of action, (Dkt. No. 7), which the Court is required to do under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). The Court granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within 30 days. Plaintiff timely filed a proposed amended complaint.

1 To state a claim for relief, a complaint must contain a short and plain statement of the  
2 grounds for the court’s jurisdiction, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the  
3 claimant is entitled to relief, and a demand for the relief sought. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The  
4 factual allegations of a complaint must be “enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative  
5 level.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). In addition, the factual  
6 allegations of a complaint must state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. Ashcroft v.  
7 Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). A claim is plausible on its face “when the plaintiff pleads  
8 factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable  
9 for the misconduct alleged.” Id.

10 Unfortunately, the amended complaint must also be dismissed for failure to state a cause  
11 of action. It is still not clear what wrong Plaintiff is alleging or what claims he may have. He is  
12 attempting to sue the Port of Seattle Police but has not identified what they have done to harm  
13 him or violate his rights. It may be that he has been denied public benefits, possibly because of a  
14 2015 incident. (See Dkt. No. 8 ¶¶ 3–4.) However, he also mentions international travel from  
15 Canada, so it is possible he has a concern relating to treatment by border officers, rather than  
16 local law enforcement. In any case, it is difficult to discern any claim against the Port of Seattle  
17 Police that could arise from the few facts he has alleged, so the Court is left to speculate as to  
18 what cause of action, if any, Plaintiff may have. Plaintiff might consider seeking legal counsel  
19 or advice from the King County Bar Association’s attorney referral line (206-267-7010) or the  
20 Northwest Justice Project via <https://nwjustice.org/get-legal-help> or  
21 [www.washingtonlawhelp.org](http://www.washingtonlawhelp.org). Because Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief  
22 may be granted, the Court ORDERS the amended complaint be DISMISSED without prejudice.

23 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel or parties.  
24

1 Dated November 15, 2021.

2 

3 Marsha J. Pechman  
4 United States Senior District Judge  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24